## REMARKS

In view of the following discussion, the Applicant submits that none of the claims now pending in the application is made obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103. Thus, the Applicant believes that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

In addition, the Applicant's representative would like to thank Examiner Hadizonooz for kindly taking a substantial amount of time on May 14, 2009 to discuss the merits of the subject invention. The Applicant's representative is aware of the time constraint that is placed on the Examiner and is appreciative of the Examiner's willingness to devote such large quantity of time to discuss the case on the merits.

## I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-17, 20-51 AND 54-79 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-17, 20-51, and 54-79 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Lockwood patent (U.S. Patent No. 6,554,618, issued April 29, 2003, hereinafter "Lockwood") in view of the Ziv-El patent (United States Patent No. 6,302,698, issued October 16, 2001, hereinafter "Ziv-El"). In response, the Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 21, 35, 55, 69, 74, and 79 in order to more clearly recite aspects of the present invention.

Particularly, the Applicant respectfully submits that neither Lockwood nor Ziv-El discloses or suggests receiving or providing a response to a query, where the response comprises a completed response template that is <u>selected from among a plurality of response templates by the responder</u>, as claimed in Applicant's independent claims 1, 21, 35, 55, 69, 74, and 79. Specifically, the invention claimed by the Applicant forwards a <u>plurality of response templates</u> to a client device (operated by an exam taker), where <u>each of the forwarded templates may potentially be used to answer the same query</u>. This allows the exam taker to select which template(s) to use for each part of his or her response to the query, as well how many templates together will form the response. Thus, the exam taker has a degree of control over the form in which he or she uses the response templates to answer the query. This facilitates self-explanation of the exam taker's response to the query, for instance wherein the exam taker attempts to deliberately explain a complex concept in a step-by-step fashion.

The Examiner acknowledges that "Lockwood does not specifically disclose ... forwarding a plurality of response templates for answering the query ..." (Office Action, Page 2); however, the Examiner submits that Ziv-El bridges this gap in the teachings of Lockwood. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Ziv-El by contrast, teaches that <u>the person posing the query</u> (*i.e.*, an exam developer) selects the format or exercise type for the response. For instance, a display used by a teacher for constructing a query includes a drop-down list for "exercise type" (*e.g.*, multiple choice, question and snwer, fill-in-the-blanks, etc.) that results in a different edit window layout (*See, e.g.*, Ziv-El, column 15, lines 43-53). As illustrated by Figures 9, 11, and 13 of Ziv-El, the response format (*e.g.*, "template") is defined and presented to the answerer of the query <u>based on the exercise type</u>. Nowhere does Ziv-El teach that the answerer may choose the format or template in which to provide his or her answer. Thus the template forwarded to the exam taker for use in answering the question is <u>selected by the developer</u>; the exam taker has no control over the format of his or her answer.

The Applicant's claims clearly recite that a response to a query pertaining to a structured entity comprises a completed response template that <u>is selected by the user (answerer) from among a plurality of forwarded templates for answering the query</u>. Lockwood and Kershaw, as discussed, fail to disclose or suggest any of these features. Specifically, Applicant's claims 1, 21, 35, 55, 69, 74 and 79 positively recite:

> 1. A method for providing feedback, said method comprising the steps of:
> a) forwarding a query pertaining to a <u>structured entity</u> having a plurality of parts;
> b) forwarding a plurality of response templates for answering the query; and
> c) receiving a response from a first client device, wherein said response comprises a completed response template <u>linking one or more of said plurality of parts</u> of said structured entity<u>, the completed response template being selected from among the plurality of response templates by a user of the first client device</u>. (Emphasis added)

> 21. A method for providing feedback, said method comprising the steps of:
>
> a) receiving a query pertaining to a <u>structured entity</u> having a plurality of parts;

b) receiving a plurality of response templates for answering the query; and

c) providing a response to an aggregating device from a first client device, wherein said response comprises a completed response template <u>linking one or more of said plurality of parts</u> of said structured entity, <u>the completed response template being selected from among the plurality of response templates by a user providing the response.</u> (Emphasis added)

35. A computer-readable medium having stored thereon a plurality of instructions, the plurality of instructions including instructions which, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to perform the steps comprising of:

a) forwarding a query pertaining to a <u>structured entity</u> having a plurality of parts;

b) forwarding <u>a plurality of response templates</u> for answering the query; and

c) receiving a response from a first client device, wherein said response comprises a completed response template <u>linking one or more of said plurality of parts</u> of said structured entity, <u>the completed response template being selected from among the plurality of response templates by a user of the first client device.</u> (Emphasis added)

55. A computer-readable medium having stored thereon a plurality of instructions, the plurality of instructions including instructions which, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to perform the steps comprising of:

a) receiving a query pertaining to a <u>structured entity</u> having a plurality of parts;

b) receiving a plurality of response templates for answering the query; and

c) providing a response to an aggregating device from a first client device, wherein said response comprises a completed response template <u>linking one or more of said plurality of parts</u> of said structured entity, <u>the completed response template being selected from among the plurality of response templates by a user providing the response.</u> (Emphasis added)

69. An apparatus for providing feedback, said apparatus comprising:

means for forwarding a query pertaining to a <u>structured entity</u> having a plurality of parts and for forwarding a plurality of response templates for answering the query; and

means for receiving a response from a first client device, wherein said response comprises a completed response template <u>linking one or more of said</u>

plurality of parts of said structured entity, the completed response template being selected from among the plurality of response templates by a user of the first client device. (Emphasis added)

74.    An apparatus for providing feedback, said apparatus comprising:
        means for receiving a query pertaining to a structured entity having a plurality of parts and for receiving a plurality of response templates for answering the query; and
        means for providing a response to an aggregating device from a first client device, wherein said response comprises a completed response template linking one or more of said plurality of parts of said structured entity, the completed response template being selected from among the plurality of response templates by a user of the apparatus. (Emphasis added)

79.    A system for providing feedback, said system comprising:
        a first client device; and
        an aggregating device for forwarding a query pertaining to a structured entity having a plurality of parts and a plurality of response templates for answering the query to said first client device, where said aggregating device receives a response from said first client device, wherein said response comprises a completed response template linking one or more of said plurality of parts of said structured entity, the completed response template being selected from among the plurality of response templates by a user of the first client device. (Emphasis added)

As discussed, neither Lockwood nor Ziv-El discloses or suggests that a response to a query pertaining to a structured entity comprises a completed response template that is selected by the exam taker from among a plurality of forwarded templates for answering the query, as claimed in Applicant's independent claims 1, 21, 35, 55, 69, 74 and 79. Therefore, the Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 21, 35, 55, 69, 74 and 79 fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103 and are patentable thereunder.

Dependent claims 2-17, 20, 22-34, 36-51, 54, 56-68, 70-73 and 75-78 depend from claims 1, 21, 35, 55, 69 and 74, respectively, and recite at least the same patentable features recited in independent claims 1, 21, 35, 55, 69 and 74. As such, and for at least the same reasons set forth above, the Applicant submits that claims 2-

17, 20, 22-34, 36-51, 54, 56-68, 70-73 and 75-78 are not made obvious by the teachings of Lockwood in view of Ziv-El. Therefore, the Applicant submits that dependent claims 2-17, 20, 22-34, 36-51, 54, 56-68, 70-73 and 75-78 also fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103 and are patentable thereunder.

## II.  STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW OF MAY 14, 2009

In response to the Interview Summary dated May 22, 2009, the Applicants submit the following statement regarding the substance of the interview of May 14, 2009:

A)    No exhibits or demonstrations were conducted.

B)    Claim 1 was discussed.

C)    The Lockwood and Ziv-El references were discussed.

D)    The Applicant's representative agreed to amend the independent claims in order to clarify that the student can choose which of the plurality of templates to use in forming a response to the query.

E)    The Examiner's Interview Summary correctly describes the substance of the interview. However, the Applicant notes that Matthew Ma of SRI International also participated in the interview.

F)    No other pertinent matters were discussed.

G)    No agreement was reached concerning a particular claim amendment, although several suggestions were discussed.

## III.  CONCLUSION

Thus, the Applicant submits that all of the presented claims now fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103. Consequently, the Applicant believes that all of these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring the issuance of a final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is

requested that the Examiner telephone Mr. Kin-Wah Tong, Esq. at (732) 842-8110 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

May 26, 2009
Date

Kin-Wah Tong, Attorney
Reg. No. 39,400
(732) 842-8110

Wall & Tong, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702